Safety Advisory Committee
July 16, 2010
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Anderson, Erik	Materials Sciences Division	
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	X
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Cademartori, Helen	Information Technology Division	
Christensen, John N.	Earth Sciences Division	X
Earnest, Thomas N.	Physical Biosciences Division	
Floyd, Jim	Safety Advisory Committee Chair	X
Fujikawa, Brian	Nuclear Science Division	X
Ji, Qing	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	X
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Lunden, Melissa	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	
Madaras, Ron	Physics Division	
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
More, Anil V.	Office of the CFO Advisor	
Patterson, Pam	Public Affairs Advisor	
Pollard, Martin	Genomics Division	X
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Tucker, Eugene	Facilities Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Advisory Committee Secretary	X
Walter, Howard	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: Brandon DeFrancisci, Joe Dionne, Doug Fleming, John Heim, Julie Henderson, Mike Kritscher, Peter Lichty, Don Lucas, Bob Mueller, Scott Robinson, Bill Wells, Mike Wisherop

Chairman's Comments – Jim Floyd

- The EHS/Facilities interaction on space and move planning is headed in a good direction, but really just getting started. We will ask for an update in about 5 months. Performance metrics will be developed. Douglas Fleming has asked Richard DeBusk to work on a "move safe" program, similar to the one developed by the Office of the Chief Fiscal Officer.
- Flexible alternatives are being developed for electrical work authorizations. It is time to push Divisions to get them done. Nuclear Sciences and Engineering have been working with Keith Gershon to develop some model authorizations.

Safety Coordinator Issues—Weyland Wong

Weyland Wong is the Chair of the Division Safety Coordinators (DSC) Subcommittee. He will be providing monthly updates to the Safety Advisory Committee (SAC) on issues of importance to DSCs.

- Division SAC Representatives and Safety Coordinators should communicate with each other and their Division Directors.
- DSCs would like to see their EHS Liaisons and Subject Matter Experts spending more time in the field and less time in the office writing reports.
- The annual influx of summer students is underway. DSCs usually don't receive information about the students before their arrival.
- Ergonomics safety is a concern wherever there are moves and relocations.
- PUB-3000 compliance alone is not enough to ensure safety.
- Communications need to be improved. DSCs sometimes receive incomplete or no information about safety issues discussed at Division Directors meetings.
- Management walkarounds – are they still happening?
- DSCs would like to see one lab-wide Near Miss program instead of each Division trying to develop one.
- Division Self-Assessment should include SAC input and management involvement.
- Is the response to the Health, Safety and Security (HSS) audit making us safer? The HSS deliverables are not well understood.

Environment, Health and Safety (EHS) Division Strategic Initiatives – Doug Fleming

- Doug Fleming would like to address the DSCs concerns.
- The Safety Culture Improvement effort is going well.
- EHS is working with IT and a consulting firm (STC) to consolidate and improve their databases. Some of the databases are old and have little or no documentation, so they are unsupportable. They are inefficient because the design was not coordinated with work process flow. The databases need to be brought together. They are looking at affinity groups. They are looking at how the database design will support the Work Planning and Control system. The goals are to have a web-based interface that makes sense, and have systems that can talk to each other.
- EHS and Facilities have been looking at common points of conflict in their interactions. They are working with a consultant to help the people who do the work to develop solutions and come up with ongoing processes that will avoid the conflicts.
- EHS is collaborating with the Berkeley Site Office to further refine our assurance program so we can avoid problems instead of just responding to Corrective Actions.
- PUB-3000 is being restructured to include Quick Start Guides for each chapter. In addition, EHS is looking at standardizing the format for other documents, such as the Chemical Hygiene and Safety Plan.

- EHS is looking at examples of excellence that occur in some programs and divisions to see how they could be expanded Lab-wide.
- EHS will be working on 2011 strategic planning, including goals and directives.

Safety Culture – Jim Floyd

We now have a very experienced consultant on board to help with the survey effort. The survey is only one part of the assessment. Safety systems include people, organization, processes, and technology. "People" are often the missing link in ensuring safety. The survey will be a standardized process that will enable us to benchmark against other organizations that have recorded results in the DuPont database.

There are some elements of the mechanics of the survey that can be adapted to LBNL. The standard employee classifications are managers (Division Directors and above), professionals, and hourly workers. We would like to be able to collect the data by Division. Matrixed employees' responses will be collected by home division. We can ask about years of service, to capture differences in experience and attitudes. There were questions about whether experience at other UC or DOE facilities should be included, or previous industry experience.

One challenge is how to obtain an adequate and representative response. There are some people who don't work on computers. The timing of this survey needs to be coordinated with other surveys, because some people may be confused about whether they have already taken this survey, and either respond multiple times or fail to respond. The population at the Lab differs depending on the time of year. There is a conflict between maintaining confidentiality of responses and tracking who has not responded so there can be follow-up. Multiple responses per IP address need to be allowed because some people share workstations. There can be a selection bias because dissatisfied people are more likely to respond. New or infrequent Guests may not fully understand the safety systems. There are other people classified as Guests who work here full-time.

Communications will be important in getting an adequate response. A communications person has been brought into the subcommittee. The survey should be framed as part of a larger effort. We need to explain where we are going and the expectations. We have some experience from previous surveys in the best way to "get out the vote". We got a response rate of about 70% on the recent work climate survey. We could use interviews if necessary to get more response from people who are not very involved in the safety program. We need Division Directors to buy into the effort, communicate the importance of participation to their people. Different Divisions have different communications systems – flow-down through safety committees or line management chains, all-hands or group meetings, etc. Communications by the Lab Director – possibly a video – would be helpful. Sometimes a small incentive or competition between Divisions can encourage responses.

We need to think about how we are going to analyze and communicate the survey results. A thank-you memo should be sent out right after the survey is completed. The results

could be made available on a website. The survey question categories are leadership, structure, and processes and actions. The survey database can produce lots of different types of reports. We need to think about how we want the data to be analyzed. Questions where there is a spread in the range of responses will be interesting. We also need to think about which organizations we want to benchmark against.

Welding – Joe Dionne

EHS hopes to have the new welding safety chapter for PUB-3000 completed in August. There will be two categories of welding activities – high hazard and low hazard. High hazard welds would include seismic supports, pressure vessels, and other critical uses. Low hazard welds would be everything else. The Job Hazards Analyses capture the hazards, controls, and work authorizations for low-hazard processes. Engineering and Facilities have developed programs for high-hazard welding that can be used as models. The Subject Matter Expert will assist Divisions that need to perform high-hazard welding. The next step is to complete the draft and convert it to the new PUB-3000 format. SAC members would like to see the draft posted in the PUB-3000 e-room for comments. The final chapter is expected to be published by August 15. There will need to be communications about the new requirements. The subcommittee looked at the potential benefits of separating out "medium" hazards. They found that the existing hazard control processes in Divisions are working well. It was suggested that Joe Dionne look at Hot Work Permits that are being issued to check whether any processes are being missed. The differences between high and low hazard are clearly defined. There was a question about whether defining high and low hazard by the criticality of the weld captures the level of hazard to the welder performing the work.

Access Control – Don Lucas

There are three access control projects being developed:

- The first project is to develop a system that will combine training requirements with access controls. Draft roles and responsibilities have been developed. There will be local administrators for site-specific training requirements.
- The project to install access control at Donner Lab has been delayed because we need permission from the campus, and there are issues with fire safety and access for disabled persons. UC suggested an alternative that raised structural concerns.
- The bids for installing access controls for high-radiation areas came in much higher than expected. The estimates are being reviewed, and LBNL management will decide what to do.

A concern was raised that there have been problems with the software that controls access to x-ray machines. There needs to be a person in charge who can solve problems and define roles and responsibilities. There has been some confusion about responsibilities between Security, EHS, Facilities, etc. Divisions need to know what is expected of them. There needs to be a process for responding to changes in requirements. The people in Information Technology who have been working on the software are leaving in September.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SAC Secretary